

REMARKS

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for discussing this application on May 3, 2007.

During that discussion, the Applicant proposed converting the allowed claims 53 and 59 to independent claims without incorporating the "two-rule hierarchy" limitation, found in the parent independent claims 40 and 47.

No commitment as to allowability of these amended claims was made during this discussion, although the Examiner indicated that there may be prior art teaching away from the limitations found in claims 53 and 59 and showing a system where patients who are "no-shows" for appointments are effectively rewarded with additional appointment options (rather than penalized as with the present invention).


Claims 53 and 59 have now been made independent. The remaining claims have been either amended to depend upon one of these claims 53 and 59 or canceled without prejudice to the possible filing of a divisional application on previously restricted and withdrawn claims.

In light of these amendments and comments is respectfully submitted that claims 49-60 are now in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CARL D. DVORAK

By



Keith M. Baxter  
Reg. No. 31,233  
Attorney for Applicant  
Boyle Fredrickson Newholm Stein & Gratz, S.C.  
250 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1030  
Milwaukee, WI 53202

Dated: May 30, 2007